

REMARKS

2 This amendment is filed in response to the Office action dated June 17, 2004. Applicant
3 cancels claims 1 - 4 and adds claims 6 - 22. Claims 5 - 22 are pending. Applicant
4 respectfully requests reexamination and reconsideration of the application.

5

6 With regard to page 2 of the Office action, the Examiner objects the abstract is too long
7 so applicant reduces the abstract to 141 words to remove the objection.

8

9 With regard to paragraph no. 1 of the Office action, the Examiner requests the
10 trademarks be capitalized, be accompanied by generic terms, and respect trademark
11 rights. Applicant amend the specification to remove this objection and correct typos
12 without adding new matter.

13

14 Applicant has added claims 6 - 12 that are dependent on claim 5, and therefore also
15 should be allowable based on their dependency on claim 5 as well as for the separate
16 features required in claims 6 - 12.

17

18 With regard to paragraph nos. 2 - 6 of the Office action, the Examiner rejected claims 1
19 - 4 under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,857,205 to Roth
20 ("Roth"), and futher in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,487,560 to LaRue et al. (LaRue).

21

22 Applicant canceled claims 1 - 4 in favor of new claims 13 - 22. Before considering new
23 claims 13 - 22, it may help to consider the problem solved by the invention. In
24 manufacturing products, a contract manufacturer exerts considerable effort to produce
25 reliable design documents. As stated at pages 1 - 2 of the specification, it is difficult to
26 maintain the integrity of design documents, e.g., a bill of materials (BOM) or an
27 approved manufacturing list (AML) because the product cycle can last years and costs
28 will drive design organizations to change the AML many times. A BOM and AML may
29 list several thousand parts, and if the design organization maintains a single list for all
30 products, the AML may list many parts (e.g., 50,000 to 100,000). Consequently, a
contract manufacturer has incentives to keep its design documents confidential. If not,

1 the design organization can disclose the reliable design document to a competitor who
2 can undercut the contract manufacturer's costs since the competitor has a free ride on
3 the cost of producing a reliable design document. Assuming the design organization is
4 unaware of the contract manufacturer's corrections, the design organizations will
5 transmit versions with errors. The contract manufacturer must avoid overwriting its
6 corrections when receiving more recent versions from the design organization.

7

8 The invention addresses this problem by providing a computer implemented system to
9 validate data in the design document transmitted over a computer network from a
10 design organization to a contract manufacturer where the design document with data to
11 use for the contract manufacturer to manufacture the product. This ensures competitors
12 cannot "free ride" on contract manufacturer's efforts in producing reliable design
13 documents.

14

15 In view of this, Roth and LaRue are not prior art to the invention because (1) they are
16 not in the same field of endeavor, and (2) they are not reasonably pertinent to solving
17 the problem. Roth relates to determining if versions of data item have changed in an
18 unexpected manner using statistics, while LaRue relates to systems for synchronizing
19 information contained in datasets across networks susceptible to out of delivery order.

20 Roth and LaRue fail to suggest software instructing a computer to perform the steps of:
21 storing a past version of the design document;

22 receiving and storing a new version of the design document;

23 storing a dictionary;

24 comparing the new version to the past version of the design document to detect
25 a change in the data; and

26 if there is a change in the data, performing the steps of setting the past version to
27 the new version of the design document, and using the dictionary to correct and validate
28 the data that has changed between the past and new version resulting in a design
29 document with data to use for the contract manufacturer to manufacture the product as
30 required in new claim 13.

1 Claims 14 - 22 are dependent on claim 13, and should be allowable based on their
2 dependency on claim 13 as well as for their additional limitations.

3

4 In view of the above, applicant submits claims 5 - 22 are allowable, and the application
5 is in condition for allowance.

6

7 Please call if you have any question, comment, or it will expedite prosecution.

8

9

10

11 Respectfully Submitted,

12 Robert Moll

13 Robert Moll

14 Reg. No. 33,741

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 1173 St. Charles Court

25 Los Altos, CA 94024

26 Tel: 650-567-9153

27 Fax: 650-567-9183

28 Email: rgmoll@patentplanet.com

29

30